

ESTABLISHING LINKAGES BETWEEN TANF AND CHILD WELFARE

Final Report

Prepared by:

Courtney J. Kakuska
Associate

Jeanette M. Hercik, Ph.D.
Project Manager

Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street
Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 385-3200
DUNS #15-069-8421

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ESTABLISHING LINKAGES BETWEEN TANF AND CHILD WELFARE	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	1
III. WORKGROUP RECOMMNDATIONS.....	2
IV. ESTABLISHING LINKAGES BETWEEN TANF AND CHILD WELFARE ROUNDTABLE.....	4
1. MEETING OVERVIEW.....	4
2. MODEL PROGRAMS: OPTIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL COORDINATION	4
3. SPOTLIGHT ON STATE AND COUNTY CONCERNS AND PROMISING PRACTICES	5
3.1 Leadership and Training.....	6
3.2 Strength-based Approach and Family Orientation.....	6
3.3 Philosophy.....	6
3.4 Policy and Practice	7
V. ACTION PLANNING.....	8
1. FUNDING.....	8
2. CASELOAD AND PERSONNEL.....	8
3. PHILOSOPHY	9
4. POLICY AND PRACTICE	9
5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS	10
5.1 The State.....	10
5.2 The Court System.....	11
5.3 The Federal Government.....	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

	<u>Page</u>
VI. CONCLUSION.....	12
APPENDIX A: EVALUATIONS	
APPENDIX B: ROUNDTABLE AGENDA	
APPENDIX C: SPEAKERS AND PARTICIPANTS	

ESTABLISHING LINKAGES BETWEEN TANF AND CHILD WELFARE

I. INTRODUCTION

The Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network, with the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project, hosted a Roundtable entitled *Establishing Linkages Between TANF and Child Welfare Programs* May 31, 2002 in Sacramento, CA. This Roundtable was attended by representatives from four States (NC, NJ, WI, CO) as well as the State of California and ten of its counties currently working toward improving service coordination.

The second of two events, the Roundtable was designed to enhance the agenda of the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project's *LINKAGES* conference, held May 30, 2002 and attended by more than 400 people. *LINKAGES* participants were primarily county-level administrators in the State of California. This report includes some highlights from the larger *LINKAGES* conference and provides a full recap of the smaller Roundtable session sponsored by Welfare Peer TA. The Roundtable evaluations are presented at Appendix A, the roundtable agenda at Appendix B, and the speaker and participant list at Appendix C.

Roundtable speakers offered lessons learned in integrating child welfare and TANF services and served as resources for the California counties. The counties, in turn, shared fresh perspectives and innovative programming ideas with the speakers. They shared promising practices in the area of collaboration and coordination between TANF and child welfare services, identified challenges and strategies to overcome those challenges, and planned action steps to facilitate improved services to families engaged with both systems.

II. BACKGROUND

Children living in families earning less than \$15,000 annually are more than 22 times more likely to experience maltreatment than those children whose families earn at least \$30,000.¹ This intersection of child poverty and child maltreatment validates offering financial support and employment services to low-income and/or TANF-receiving families as a means of preventing possible involvement with the child welfare system. However, while the families served by the two systems are often in common, the systems themselves do not always work well together.

¹ Sedlak, A.J., & Broadhurst, D.D. (1996). *Third National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.

In response to this lack of coordination, the State of California, through the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project, hosted by the California Center for Research on Women and Families (CCRWF), organized over 70 State and county leaders into five work groups to “identify priorities, conduct research, debate options, and refine recommendations to coordinate [TANF] and [child welfare services] to strengthen families.”² On May 30, 2002, the recommendations of those work groups were unveiled at the *Linkages* conference.

III. WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations represent months of intense work on the part of the workgroups, and they set the stage for the discussions held at the following day’s Roundtable event. Kate Karpilow and Linda Orrante highlighted some of the workgroup recommendations in the letter welcoming participants to the LINKAGES conference:

The **Organizational Structures Work Group** identified the **building blocks** of coordinated services—**Leadership, Service Delivery, and Administration**. They offer three **organizational structures—the Coordinated Case Planning Model, the Intensive Services Model, and the One Door Model**—that county leaders can tailor to the unique needs and circumstances of their communities. They present a chart of possible **target populations** that can be served through the coordination of CalWORKs and CWS. Because this Work Group carefully considered factors related to each of the building blocks, their document serves as a *Planning Guide* for leaders interested in launching coordinated services.

The **Flexible Financing Work Group** makes specific fiscal recommendations for **changes in state and federal law** to support coordinated services. They propose **modifications to the definition of needy families** used for CalWORKs Performance Incentive Funds, **provision of a one-time state allocation** to plan and implement linkages between county CalWORKs and CWS programs, **consolidation of some child welfare services allocations**, and **support for changes in the federal funding structure** to increase and broaden support for children. They present **case studies** to assist county leaders in identifying new funding sources or braiding existing funds; and they call for state-level support—through conferences, seminars, and the development of new tools—to facilitate increased information sharing among county leaders.

The **Coordinated Case Planning Work Group** provides county leaders both a conceptual framework and practical guidelines to plan and implement coordinated case planning.

² Conference announcement letter, May 30, 2002. California Center for Research on Children and Families.

They describe the **benefits** of coordinated case planning and put forth **four models**—Informal Communication, Managed Informal Communication, Linked Case Plans, and Unified Case Plan. Using a **practical approach** that will be appreciated by service providers, the Work Group identifies **five components of coordinated case planning**: client identification and referral, team development and communication, client and family assessment, development of a coordinated service plan, and case management and case resolution. The Work Group also offers guidelines for the numerous administrative decisions related to coordinated case planning.

The **Organizational Change and Training Work Group** offers numerous recommendations and **guidelines to assist counties with organizational change issues** that arise from efforts to coordinate CalWORKs and CWS. They also recommend a **core curriculum**, which includes a basic orientation and training on working with families, case coordination and confidentiality, team work and decision making, and supervising in the coordinated services environment.

The **Data Systems and Confidentiality Work Group** produced two sets of recommendations. The Work Group's focus on data systems yielded case studies of **how to identify mutual clients**, either manually or through an automated process. Based on research, they assert that confidentiality concerns should not restrict coordination of services—that **confidentiality protocols *already exist to safeguard privacy concerns*** and allow respectful transfer of information among caseworkers. They provide a **model consent form** developed by the Youth Law Center, and offer **specific and practical tips on educating staff, clients, and partners**.³

In addition to releasing the findings in writing, members of each work group made presentations during plenary or breakout sessions at the conference. The Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network supported the working lunch session entitled “Coordinating TANF and CWS — How Other States are Succeeding,” featuring Levetta Love, TANF Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, El Paso County Colorado, and Hobert Freeman, Director, Department of Social Services, Edgecombe County, North Carolina. El Paso County serves a population of over 500,000 with a staff of 350 and an annual budget of \$96 million. The North Carolina TANF/Child Welfare Collaborative of nine counties is a two-year project of the North Carolina Association of County Directors of Social Services.

Breakout sessions featured promising practices from four California counties (Orange, San Luis Obispo, Yolo, and Los Angeles) as well as a more detailed presentation from Levetta

³ Karpilow, K., & Orrante, L. (2002). Welcoming Letter, CalWORKs Linkages Conference.

Love and Hobert Freeman. In the closing session, “Where Do We Go From Here?” county and State personnel from California’s TANF and CWS agencies hosted an open discussion with participants about statewide priorities and activities that will support coordinated services.

IV. ESTABLISHING LINKAGES BETWEEN TANF AND CHILD WELFARE ROUNDTABLE

The Welfare Peer TA Network, in partnership with the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project, designed the Roundtable to build on the lessons learned at the *Linkages* Conference, and to facilitate increased information sharing between California counties attempting to integrate child welfare and TANF services.

1. MEETING OVERVIEW

The Roundtable opened with remarks from Sylvia Pizzini, Deputy Director, Children and Family Services Division and Bruce Wagstaff, Deputy Director, Welfare to Work Division, California Department of Social Services. While California is a county-administered TANF State, leadership and commitment to coordinated services at the State level is critically important to long-term success. The commitment from the State was evidenced by the full participation of Deputy Directors Pizzini and Wagstaff.

2. MODEL PROGRAMS: OPTIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL COORDINATION

Following these opening remarks, Hobert Freeman, Levetta Love, and Robyn Saviano, Women’s Treatment Specialist for the Milwaukee (WI) Family Services Coordination Initiative briefly presented on their respective programs.

Edgecombe County’s Total Independence Program (TIP) “provides support and service management to customers who desire to be self-sufficient within 90 days.” TIP endeavors to serve families holistically and to prevent their involvement with cash assistance and/or child welfare programs. Because of its coordinated approach to service delivery, the TIP program minimizes the number of workers involved with each family, yet maximizes the services available to them. TIP social workers work with the family to develop a Family Service Plan “to identify those activities and services that would support the customer in achieving his or her goals the Plan may include activities such as:

- Work experience
- Short-term training
- Job search
- Employment
- Benefits and services both within the agency and with community partners that be utilized by the customer
- Any other activities leading to self-sufficiency.

El Paso County Colorado has over 500,000 residents in 2,100 square miles. The Department of Human Services mission is “to strengthen families, assure safety, promote self-sufficiency, eliminate poverty, and improve the quality of life in our community.” In its draft policy on coordination of services for families between child welfare and economic assistance programs, El Paso County articulates sixteen steps, from initial intake to evaluation, for successfully coordinating these services. Highlights include recommendations for “family-focused, strength-based, professional, and prompt” services, joint site visits, and a written plan developed with the family “to include the use of a strength-based assessment process.”

The Milwaukee Family Services Coordination Initiative targets families jointly engaged with W-2 (Wisconsin’s TANF program), child welfare, and substance abuse treatment services. The mission of the initiative is to “develop an integrated service network that assists dependent and vulnerable families attain self-sufficiency by building upon their strengths and supporting through formal and informal service networks.” Currently, four training modules are available for download from the Initiative. These modules, *Working with W-2*, *Child Welfare Safety Services*, *and Financial Assistance to Support Our Families*; *Working with Families Experiencing the Impact of Substance Abuse*; *Working with Families When Their Multiple Needs Include Mental Health Issues*, and; *Working with Families Experiencing Intimate Family Violence* are online at <http://fare-wi.org/mfsc.htm>.

3. SPOTLIGHT ON STATE AND COUNTY CONCERNS AND PROMISING PRACTICES

After brief presentations on options for successful coordination. Representatives from these model programs engaged in a discussion with the county representatives. Out of this interactive discussion, emerged the following recommendations and observations, grouped into general themes:

3.1 Leadership and Training

- Leadership is key—engaging high-level leadership (e.g. State and/or County administrators) will not only be helpful in program development and agenda setting, but will support projects in challenging times.
- Train supervisors and develop a needs-driven plan—recognize that supervisors need training as well as caseworkers. A system in which caseworkers are trained on a new model/philosophy but their caseworkers are not is doomed to failure.
- Ongoing process of demonstration and continuous training—recognize that initial implementation is only the first step to success. Constant improvement and continuous training will lead to better outcomes for customers and staff alike.
- Involve customers and high-level leadership—do not engage key leadership on paper only. Involve all relevant parties, *including the customer*, in all facets of major planning and administrative decision-making.

3.2 Strength-based Approach and Family Orientation

- You must listen to the family—families are the experts when it comes to their particular situation. They tend to know exactly what they need and are relying on the caseworker to help them to access services, not to reconfigure those needs. Certainly, case workers should assist families in developing comprehensive self-awareness, but should work with the family as an equal partner.
- Be responsive (i.e. train staff, modify hours). Reviewing policies and practices and soliciting customer feedback to improve services is important. However, this information, once gathered, must be operationalized. If customers report, for example, that they struggle to keep appointments because the office is open only when they are at work, consider extended and/or weekend office hours.
- Training and thoughtful dialogue can overcome the lack of understanding surrounding what it truly means to be family-centered and strength-based. Participants found a significant misunderstanding about what a family-centered and strength-based approach entails. Thorough training and follow-up conversations can ameliorate this confusion.

3.3 Philosophy

- Focus on values and beliefs, draw a vision, and establish working models that go with it. In order to integrate services successfully, the first step is to recognize the shared values of supporting families and children. Building on these shared values, a vision for service integration can be developed. Once the vision is in place, working models useful for operationalizing that vision can be advanced.

- “You can’t be partly holistic.” Dealing with families in a holistic manner is one of the most commonly heard value statements. This comment, however, reminds human services personnel that a holistic approach to serving families must permeate all aspects of the service delivery process.
- Constantly recognize and affirm the need for change and importance of the task at hand. In the beginning of a new partnership initiative, all the participants have grand visions and a great deal of energy. However, as time passes, it is possible to become disillusioned or overwhelmed by the task at hand. Leaders must reiterate the importance of developing these partnerships.
- Foster passion. While a few committed individuals can effect great change, it is important to foster this commitment and to extend it to as many of those involved as possible.

3.4 Policy and Practice

- Sometimes you need to do it first. It is possible to over-plan. Sometimes, when this happens, the solution is to begin by doing something. Putting a plan in place and modifying later can end a stalemate.
- By highlighting what other people have already done, we can educate counties about what is possible. Meanwhile, recognize that there is always something upon which to build future success.
- Operating on a “need-to-know basis” overcomes lack of cross-awareness and ‘hyper-awareness’ of confidentiality concerns. Concerns over confidentiality are among the most commonly cited barriers to collaboration and information sharing. By operating on a need-to-know basis, personnel are more comfortable and feel as though they are “doing right” by their clients.
- Identify barriers and strategize together about how to overcome them. It is possible for agency personnel to become internally focused and to forget that their potential collaborators face barriers as well, and that these barriers might very well be different than their own.. Once all the barriers are identified, mutual strategies to overcome these barriers can be developed.
- Develop tools. Don’t be satisfied with a philosophical commitment to collaborate. Rather, develop the resources and tools necessary to make the collaboration happen. Tools might include cross-training and/or facilitation manuals.

V. ACTION PLANNING

After discussing the strategies they've used to overcome identified issues and barriers, roundtable participants shifted their focus to remaining challenges and strategies to address them. The session concluded with articulation of the needs California counties⁴ have for the State, Federal government, and the Courts.

1. FUNDING

- Strengthen prevention services. Use TANF and IV-B funds for early prevention/diversion services.
- Perform cost avoidance analysis to illustrate the cost effectiveness of prevention vs. intervention. For example, compare the \$5600/month cost for a child living in congregate care to the \$1000/month to rental expenditure that would allow the family to remain together.
- Earmark percentage for flexible funding. Flexible funding allows for creative strategies to meet the specific needs of a particular family. This flexibility improves cost effectiveness by eliminating the need to enroll a family in programs they don't need as a means of accessing the services they do need.

2. CASELOAD AND PERSONNEL

- Not all cases are created equal. Some require much more work than others. Thus, it is imperative to focus on the *work* load not *case* load of social workers and case managers.
- There is a disconnect between the social work model used in child welfare and the case management model used in TANF. Recognize the differences in the two models and focus on the shared priorities of healthy, stable families as a bridge.
- All staff, in both child welfare and TANF, must be valued for the contributions they bring. They require adequate training. An environment in which certain staff members are made to feel less qualified or important than their counterparts will thwart efforts at collaboration.

⁴ Although California is a county-administered TANF State, many of these strategies can be applied to local entities in State administered States as well.

3. PHILOSOPHY

- The objective of fostering collaboration is to focus on what families need as opposed to limitations of different departments. Care must be taken to avoid being caught-up in a bureaucratic or public administration dialogue at the expense of improving service delivery.
- The work is not about audits or caseloads. It is about leadership and family.
- Not all families are the same. A “one size fits all” or “cookie cutter” approach will not meet the needs of all families.
- View child welfare through the eyes of the child. Consider what it must be like to be engaged in the child welfare system as a child and endeavor to design programs to limit the hardships a child must face.
- Training and education efforts can overcome the level of abstraction about terms and their meaning. For example, many social workers and case managers believe they are operating in a “strengths-based” model simply because they hear about that model all day. A sort of “group think” takes over and little real attention is paid to practice as opposed to language.

4. POLICY AND PRACTICE

- Even as they see small efforts being made to incorporate this concept of collaboration, staff remember the history of lack of follow-through on prior reform efforts and wonder why this will be different. By engaging staff in the policy design and planning processes, they can offer their suggestions for ways to ensure this effort moves from commitment to execution.
- Information sharing is a key component of successful collaboration. However, the welfare system is not set up to give out information, but to take it in. Further, TANF is not set up for outreach procedures. Practical considerations like this must be considered and planned for. Once the limits of the system(s) are identified, strategies to work within, and when necessary, around, the systems can be developed.
- Foster productive communication. While people complain differently, there is often a valuable lesson to be learned in what they’re saying. Rather than dismissing these comments as “whining,” endeavor to hear what staff and clients are really saying, and then respond in the appropriate manner. These individuals are valuable resources for designing and improving programs.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS

After articulating these challenges and strategies, the group identified supports they need from the State, court system, and Federal government to foster collaboration efforts.

5.1 The State

The State can foster collaboration between child welfare and TANF services by:

- Foster cross-program awareness. The child welfare system has a different set of objectives than the TANF program. By engaging the systems in a supportive dialogue and developing cross-program awareness, the State can eliminate several potential barriers that would grow out of misunderstanding.
- Providing training on funding and service coordination. There are still many things about service and funding coordination that are unknown. Further, there are vastly varying levels of success in different administrative units (e.g. counties, localities). The State should offer more training and/or technical assistance on these issues.
- Providing fiscal incentives for successful collaboration. Financial gain is a highly motivating factor. If collaboration is truly a priority, rewarding entities with successful collaborative efforts makes sense.
- Maintaining the momentum. When local administrative units become too overwhelmed with their daily operations, the State can regenerate the excitement about collaboration. Further, the State can help to prevent this momentum lag by, for example, hosting town hall meetings to bring fresh voices and ideas into the dialogue.
- Identifying and harvesting the “low-hanging fruit.” The “low-hanging fruit” are those outcomes that can be readily achieved in the short-term. Accomplishing these tasks, even if they are small, generates renewed enthusiasm for the project.
- Sharing information. The State should make its priorities clear, and support the sharing of information between local administrative units.
- Establishing a confidentiality structure. Confidentiality concerns continue to dominate the list of barriers to successful collaboration. Misinformation about the confidentiality rules abounds, and creates unnecessary complications in the process. The State can remedy this situation by producing a clear set of guidelines regarding the appropriate sharing of information between child welfare and TANF agencies.
- Establishing flexible funding guidelines. Local administrative units often have very clever and innovative ideas about the best ways to support families in their jurisdictions. However, this innovation can not flourish if they are concerned about

the allowability of their efforts under the funding structure. Much like the confidentiality structure, the State should provide guidance on appropriate expenditures of flexible funding monies.

5.2 The Court System

The Court system can foster collaboration between child welfare and TANF services by:

- Supporting mock trials to train new social workers in the processes of the court system.
- Welcoming education about child welfare issues and appreciating the reality of child welfare system. The child welfare system is not in a position to offer education services to the court unless the court recognizes this need and welcomes the education.
- Supporting the social work professional in court. Social workers are not always treated with respect and professional courtesy in a court room setting. Many are uncomfortable with the judicial process. Court personnel should recognize the dedication of the social workers and work with them to achieve the best possible outcomes for children and families.
- Recognizing that “a social worker in court is one less social worker in a home.” Everyone has tight schedules, but if court personnel constantly recognize the pressing need for social workers to be in the field and attempt in all possible ways to limit the amount of time they are required to be in court, the social workers will not only have more time to serve the rest of their caseload, but can find time as well to collaborate more effectively with their TANF counterparts.
- Supporting the need for prevention services. Prevention services keep children and families from ever becoming engaged with the court system. By recognizing that the child welfare and TANF systems have the best interests of the children and families at heart, the court system should support the efforts of these workers are making to serve the families outside of court.
- Supporting a “differential response for criminal conduct vs. parenting issues.” This concept, offered by the State of North Carolina, reminds us that there are varying levels of challenges faced by families. The court system can support effective collaboration by recognizing these differences, supporting an appropriate definition of abuse and neglect, and focusing on safety instead of risk.

5.3 The Federal Government

The Federal government can foster collaboration between child welfare and TANF services by:

- Clarifying their perspective on coordination and how they're going to support it. States and local administrative units require very clear Federal guidance about collaboration, and want to see Federal efforts (particularly training and TA around) aimed at translating policies into action, and directed at supporting their efforts.
- Engaging in a conversation with the States. The States want to hear from the Federal government, but they also have many great ideas of their own they'd like to share. Together, the States and Federal government can establish priorities that best serve the families engaged with the child welfare and TANF systems.
- Increasing flexible funding. The creative policies designed at the State level need funding streams that are flexible enough to accommodate their innovation. More money set-aside for flexible funding is essential to successful collaboration.
- Providing guidance on confidentiality. There is a need for concrete, accurate, user-friendly guidance on addressing the issues of confidentiality in cross-program collaboration, especially because of the sensitive nature of data collected in the TANF and child welfare programs. The Federal government should offer this guidance to the States who can then tailor it for their local administrative units.
- Eliminating the 1996 look-back provisions OR tying eligibility to TANF. By requiring States to "look-back" to AFDC provisions to determine eligibility for Medicaid and Foster Care and Adoption assistance, an undue administrative burden is created. Either eliminate these provisions or tie them to TANF eligibility determinations.
- Offering a universal mandate on data interface that is couched in an understanding of local issues. That is, provide practical guidance on, and funding for, this process, but recognize that it must be flexible enough to be implemented locally.

VI. CONCLUSION

Together, the Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network, the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project, and the Roundtable participants made this Roundtable a great success. This report has provided an overview of the Roundtable. The Roundtable successfully enhanced the agenda of the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project's *LINKAGES* conference. Participants left Sacramento with several tools in-hand including the draft recommendations unveiled at the *Linkages* conference, best practices from several programs across California and around the country, and the action items they developed at the close the Roundtable. In addition, the networks established ensure shared access to future promising practices and lessons learned.

Specific outcomes of the Roundtable have already been reported to us. While the primary focus of the Roundtable was to improve the capacity of the California counties, the State participants benefited as well. For example, the State of New Jersey used the information gathered at the Roundtable to improve their TANF and Child Welfare intake forms. Further, several California counties have contacted the Welfare Peer TA Network to initiate discussions regarding future technical assistance we might be able to provide to them.

The Appendices below include the Roundtable evaluations, agenda, and participant and speakers lists.

**APPENDIX A:
EVALUATIONS**

EVALUATIONS

Participants were asked to evaluate the services provided at the *Establishing Linkages Between TANF and Child Welfare Roundtable* by rating the following statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
Conference planners adequately prepared you for the meeting by providing clear written and verbal communication regarding the meeting's purpose and expected outcomes.	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%
Conference planners handled the preparation, arrangements, and scheduling of the event in a timely, courteous, and competent manner.	0%	0%	10%	40%	40%
The speakers were thorough in the subject areas presented.	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%
The speakers engaged the audience and facilitated interactive discussions.	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%
The information will be useful to me/my staff in developing collaborative efforts.	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%

What did you find most useful about attending this roundtable (i.e. any immediate or long-term benefits to you/your staff that you anticipate as a result of attending this roundtable, etc.)?

- Suggestions to market the ideas/programs/processes already out there.
- Grounding in the approach
- Learned about issues and how to approach resolving them
- The roundtable format and exchange of ideas and information
- Ideas for systems linkages

What issues would you like to have had more discussion about during the roundtable?

- Consistent supervisor
- Fiscal flexibility
- Strengths-based process to support staff
- Creativity in obtaining funding

**APPENDIX B:
ROUNDTABLE AGENDA**



ROUNDTABLE AGENDA



Establishing Linkages Between TANF and Child Welfare

Sponsored by:

The Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
with *The CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project*

Sacramento, CA ♦ May 31, 2002
Sheraton Grand Sacramento

7:30am – 8:00am	Networking Breakfast
8:00am – 8:30am	Welcome and Opening Remarks Kate Karpilow, Project Director, CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project Linda Orrante, Project Coordinator, CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project Courtney Kakuska, Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network
8:30am – 9:00am	Meeting Overview Sylvia Pizzini, Deputy Director, Children and Family Services Division, & Bruce Wagstaff, Deputy Director, Welfare to Work Division, California Department of Social Services
9:00am – 10:00am	Model Programs: Options for Successful Coordination <i>The North Carolina Experience:</i> Hobert Freeman <i>The El Paso County, CO Experience:</i> Levetta Love <i>The Milwaukee Family Services Coordination Initiative:</i> Robyn Saviano
10:00am – 10:15am	Break
10:15am – 10:45am	Discussion of Model Programs and Coordination Strategies What State and County strategies have made coordination work? What strategies have made coordination difficult?
10:45am – 11:45am	Spotlight on State and County Concerns & Promising Practices Participants discuss their own challenges to coordination and offer each other suggestions for overcoming these challenges.
11:45am – 12:45pm	Action Planning How can States and Counties further coordination? How can the Federal government further coordination?
12:45pm – 1:00pm	Evaluation and Closing Remarks

**APPENDIX C:
SPEAKERS AND PARTICIPANTS**

SPEAKERS

Hobert Freeman

Edgecombe County Department of Social Services
3003 N. Main Street
Tarboro, NC 27886
Telephone: 252-641-7631
Email: hobertf@co.edgecombe.nc.us

Kate Karpilow

CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project
California Center for Research on Women and Families
1654 Solano Avenue, Suite D
Berkeley, CA 94707
Telephone: 510-559-2696
Fax: 510-559-2699
Email: karpilow@ccrwf.org

Levetta Love

El Paso County Department of Human Resources
105 N. Spruce Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80905
Telephone: 719-444-8153
Fax: 719-444-5320
Email: levettalove@elpasoco.com

Linda Orrante

CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project
California Center for Research on Women and Families
1654 Solano Avenue, Suite D
Berkeley, CA 94707
Telephone: 510-559-2696
Fax: 510-559-2699
Email: orrante@ccrwf.org

Sylvia Pizzini

California Department of Social Services
Children and Family Services
744 P Street, M/S 17-18
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-657-2614
Fax: 916-657-2049
Email: spizzini@dss.ca.gov

Annette Riordan

New Jersey Department of Human Resources
Office of Policy and Planning
222 South Warrant Street
PO Box 700
Trenton, NJ 08625
Telephone: 609-292-9688
Fax: 609-292-1743
Email: annette.riordan@dhs.state.nj.us

Robyn Saviano

Wisconsin Bureau of Substance Abuse Services
1 West Wilson street
Madison, WI 53707
Telephone: 608-267-3948
Email: saviarr@dhfs.state.wi.us

Bruce Wagstaff

California Department of Social Services
744 P Street, M/S 17-18
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-657-3546
Fax: 916-653-1716
Email: bwagstaff@dss.ca.gov

PARTICIPANTS

Sharrell Blakeley

County of Riverside
4060 County Circle Drive
Riverside, CA 92503
Telephone: 909-358-3026
Fax: 909-358-3878
Email: shblakel@co.riverside.ca.us

Sarah Boehm

CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership
Project
California Center for Research on Women
and Families
1654 Solano Avenue, Suite D
Berkeley, CA 94707
Telephone: 510-559-2696
Fax: 510-559-2699
Email: stboehm@pacbell.net

Jim Brown

California Department of Children's
Services
744 P Street, M/S 14-44
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-657-1881
Fax: 916-654-1295
Email: jbrown@dss.ca.gov

Nenita Dean

Stanislaus County Community Services
Agency
PO Box 42
Modesto, CA 95353
Telephone: 209-664-8144
Fax: 209-664-8181
Email: deanne@mail.co.stanislaus.ca.us

Dwayne Elam

Butte County Department of Employment
and Social Services
2445 Carmichael Drive
Chico, CA 95927
Telephone: 530-879-3531
Fax: 530-879-3468
Email: delam@dsw.ncen.org

Debby Jeter

San Luis Obispo County Department of
Social Services
PO Box 8119
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403
Telephone: 805-781-1840
Fax: 805-781-1846
Email: djeter@co.sco.ca.us

Walter Yu-Lung Kiang

LA County Department of Children and
Family Services
425 Shatto Place
Los Angeles, CA 90020
Telephone: 213-769-6420
Fax: 213-427-6197
Email: kiangw@dcss.co.la.ca.us

Michael L. Riley

County of Orange Social Service Agency
Children and Family Services
888 N. Main Street, Bldg. 160
Santa Ana, CA 92701
Telephone: 714-541-7769
Fax: 714-541-7811
Email: mriley@ssa.co.orange.ca.us

Lydia Romeo

County of Santa Clara Social Services
Agency
333 W. Julian Street
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: 408-491-6738
Fax: 408-975-4524
Email: lydia.romeo@ssa.co.santa-clara.ca.us

Diana Williams

Yolo County Department of Economic and
Social Services
Children and Adult Services
25 N. Cottonwood St
Woodland, CA 95695
Telephone: 530-661-2951
Fax: 530-661-2658
Email: diana.williams@yolocounty.org

CONTRACT STAFF

Courtney Kakuska

Associate

Caliber Associates

10530 Rosehaven St., Ste. 400

Fairfax, VA 22124

Telephone: 703-385-3200

Fax: 703-385-3206

Email: kakuskac@calib.com